

REMARKS

This paper responds to the Office Action mailed on November 15, 2004. Claims 31-57 are canceled and claims 58-81 are added such that claims 58-81 are now pending in this application.

Double Patenting Rejection

Claims 31-57 were provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claims 2-31 and 33-36 of co-pending Application No. 09/751,329. Applicant has canceled claims 31-57 such that this rejection is moot.

§112 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 31-57 were rejected under 35 USC § 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Claims 47-51 were rejected under 35 USC § 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Applicant has canceled claims 31-57 such that these rejections are moot.

§103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 31-41, 43-46, 52, 54, 57 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being obvious over Jackson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,741,944) in view of Taylor (U.S. Patent No. 4,781,966).

Claims 55 and 56 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jackson et al. in view of Taylor as set forth above, and further in view of Lang et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,429,261).

Claims 31-37, 40, 41, 43-47 and 54-57 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wideman (U.S. Patent No. 4,606,964) et al. in view Jackson et al.

Claims 38, 39 and 48-53 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wideman et al. in view Jackson et al. and further in view of Buczwinski et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,785,179).

Claim 53 was rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jackson et al. in view of Taylor as set forth above, and further in view of Buczwinski et al.

Claim 42 was rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jackson et al. and further in view of Taylor as set forth above, and further in view of Wright (U.S. Patent No. 5,385,775).

Claim 42 as rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wideman et al. in view Jackson et al. as set forth above and further in view of Wright.

Applicant has canceled claims 31-57 such that these rejections are moot.

New Claims 58-81

Support for new claims 58-81 is found in the Applicant's specification and drawings. Applicant notes that none of the cited reference appears to include (among other items) wet wipes that increase in thickness as they are removed from a dispenser.

Allowance of claims 58-81 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney (612) 349-9587 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

DAVID J. BAER ET AL.

By their Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(612) 349-9587

Date 3/15/05

By Andrew R. Peret
Andrew R. Peret
Reg. No. 41,246

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop RCB, Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 15 day of March, 2005.

CANDIS BUENDING

Name

Candis Buending
Signature